

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|-------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------|---|-----------------------|--|
| 09/853,160 | 05/11/2001 | Satoru Funakoshi | 7372/71158 | 6913 | |
| 22242 7 | 7590 04/26/2004 | | EXAM | INER | |
| FITCH EVEN TABIN AND FLANNERY | | | NORDMEYER | NORDMEYER, PATRICIA L | |
| 120 SOUTH L | A SALLE STREET | | | | |
| SUITE 1600 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| CHICAGO, IL 60603-3406 | | | 1772 | | |
| | | | D. (D.) () () () () () () () () () | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | |
|--|---|---|-------------|--|--|--|
| Advisory Action | 09/853,160 | FUNAKOSHI, SATO |)RU | | | |
| / ta/1001 y / totte: | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| | Patricia L. Nordmeyer | 1772 | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence addi | ress | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 24 March 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. | | | | | | |
| PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)] | | | | | | |
| a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection. | | | | | | |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | | | | | | |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on 24 March 2004. Ap 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF | pellant's Brief must be filed with R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal o | nin the period set fo of the appeal. | rth in | | | |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be | ecause: | | | | | |
| (a) \square they raise new issues that would require further | er consideration and/or search (| see NOTE below); | | | | |
| (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below); | | | | | | |
| (c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or | | | | | | |
| (d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE: | | | | | | |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject | tion(s): | | | | | |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). | | | | | | |
| 5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: See | reconsideration has been consessive attached sheet. | idered but does NO | T place the | | | |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becraised by the Examiner in the final rejection. | ause it is not directed SOLELY | to issues which wer | e newly | | | |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(explanation of how the new or amended claims wo | (s) a)⊠ will not be entered or b) ould be rejected is provided belc |)□ will be entered a ow or appended. | and an | | | |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: None. | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: None | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: 1 and 2. | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>3-8</u> . | | | | | | |
| 8. The drawing correction filed on is a) appr | roved or b) disapproved by t | the Examiner. | | | | |
| 9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen | · | | | | | |
| 10. Other: | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

Application/Control Number: 09/853,160

Art Unit: 1772

DETAILED ACTION

Continuation of #5: The applicant is not placed in condition for allowance because:

Applicant's arguments are not persuasive. The arguments presented by the Applicant are responded to below.

In response to Applicant's argument that there is no disclosure or suggestion of any polypropylene foam in Goto et al., Goto et al. clearly discloses the presence of polypropylene foam and resin as part of the instrument panel in an automobile in Column 6, lines 28 - 32, which is part of the skin material that is being employed to make the automotive panels Even though the polypropylene foam is not the only component of the panel and is an inner layer (#202) of Goto et al., the open language, i.e. comprising, of the claims allows for other materials to be present along with the foam material.

In response to Applicant's argument that Sato is directed towards a vibrating diaphragm and not a speaker grille, Sato et al. is cited to show that it would be obvious to one skilled to make an article out of polypropylene foam having the desired density and expansion ratios, not to show the presence of a speaker grille. Even though Sato et al. is directed towards a vibrating diaphragm, it is an intended use of a polypropylene foam material, and the polypropylene foam material is being used as a speaker grille as shown by Goto et al. above.

Application/Control Number: 09/853,160

Art Unit: 1772

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patricia L. Nordmeyer whose telephone number is (571) 272-1496. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Thurs. from 7:00-4:30 & alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Harold Y. Pyon can be reached on (571) 272-1498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Patricia L. Nordmeyer Examiner

Art Unit 1772

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

4/16/04

Page 3